

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
AUSTIN DIVISION**

**OSR Enterprises AG and  
OSR R&D Israel Ltd.,  
*Plaintiffs***

**v.**

**REE Automotive Ltd.,  
REE Automotive Holding, Inc., and  
REE Automotive USA Inc.,  
*Defendants***

§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§

**Case No. 1:22-CV-01327-DII**

**ORDER**

Now before the Court are Defendants’ Opposed Motion for Protection from Discovery, or in the Alternative, to Stay Discovery Pending Resolution of Defendants’ Motion to Dismiss for Forum Non Conveniens, filed March 31, 2023 (Dkt. 25); Defendants’ Motion to Dismiss Amended Complaint for Forum Non Conveniens, Lack of Personal Jurisdiction, and Statutes of Limitations, filed May 3, 2023 (Dkt. 34); Plaintiffs’ Opposed Motion to Compel Jurisdictional and Venue Discovery and for an Extension of Time to File Plaintiffs’ Opposition Brief to the Motion to Dismiss or to Stay the Court’s Ruling until Such Discovery Occurs, filed May 12, 2023 (Dkt. 35); and the associated response and reply briefs. The District Court referred the discovery motions to this Magistrate Judge for resolution and referred Defendants’ Motion to Dismiss for a report and recommendation, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1), Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 72, and Rule 1 of Appendix C of the Local Rules of the United States District Court for the Western District of Texas (“Local Rules”). Dkt. 26; Text Orders entered May 15, 2023 and May 25, 2023.

Under the District Court’s Order entered April 28, 2023, Plaintiffs must file their Response in Opposition to Defendants’ Motion to Dismiss for *forum non conveniens* by June 7, 2023. Dkt. 33. Plaintiffs ask the Court for (1) jurisdictional and venue discovery, and (2) an extension of their

deadline to respond to Defendant's Motion to Dismiss or, alternatively, a stay of the Court's ruling on that motion. Defendants ask the Court to either stay all discovery pending resolution of their Motion to Dismiss or, in the alternative, "limit discovery to only jurisdictional considerations." Dkt. 25 at 2.

The Court hereby **ORDERS** that (1) all discovery in this case and (2) the June 7, 2023 deadline for Plaintiffs to file their Response in Opposition to Defendants' Motion to Dismiss are **HEREBY STAYED** pending a hearing on the parties' discovery motions (Dkt. 25; Dkt. 35). The Court will contact the parties to schedule the hearing.

The Court also admonishes Defendants that they must abide by this Court's Local Rules. At 30 pages, Defendants' Motion to Dismiss (Dkt. 34) grossly exceeds the 20-page limit for dispositive motions. Local Rule CV-7(c)(2). Nor should lengthy footnotes be used to circumvent page limit compliance. *See* Dkt. 38 at 11 & n.13. Any further motions not in compliance with the Local Rules may be denied.

**SIGNED** on May 26, 2023.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
SUSAN HIGHTOWER  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE